QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ATTORNEY SETTLEMENT OFFICERS Please refer to the rating factors below. Check one response for each statement.							
ATTORNEY SETTLEMENT OFFICER PANEL PROCESS	6	5	4	3	2	1	
4. At least one attorney was not adequately prepared for the proceeding.							
5. At least one party did not participate in good faith in the proceeding.							
6. At least one attorney did not participate in good faith in the proceeding.							
7. One party seemed to be reluctant to be in this Panel Program.							
8. More than one party seemed to be reluctant to be in this Panel Program.							
9. Additional discovery was needed prior to the proceeding.							
10. The proceeding helped the parties better express their personal interests, concerns, and emotions.							
11. The proceeding narrowed the issues in dispute.							
12. The proceeding reduced the costs to resolve this case.							
13. The proceeding reduced the time to resolve this case.							
14. The proceeding reduced the amount of future formal discovery.							
15. The proceeding reduced the amount of future motions to be filed.							
16. The proceeding allowed the parties to better understand and evaluate the other side's position.							
17. The proceeding encouraged the parties to be more realistic about the strengths and/or weaknesses of their respective positions in this case.							
18. The proceeding hardened positions, making a negotiated outcome more difficult.							
19. The proceeding enabled the client to actively participate in the dispute resolution process.							

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ATTORNEY SETTLEMENT OFFICERS Please refer to the rating factors below. Check one response for each statement.							
Attorney Settlement Officer Panel Process, cont.	6	5	4	3	2	1	
20. The proceeding enabled the attorneys to actively participate in the dispute resolution process.							
21. The proceeding improved communication between the different parties in the case.							
22. The proceeding preserved a relationship between the parties.							
23. The proceeding allowed the parties to explore solutions they would not likely have gotten through trial.							
24. The proceeding moved the parties toward settlement.							
25. The proceeding had little impact on the case.							
26. The proceeding was detrimental to the parties in this case.							
27. I cannot say what effect the proceeding had on the parties in this case.							
28. This was an appropriate case for me to be referred.							
29. This case should not have been referred to me.							
30. Subject matter expertise was not needed for this case.							
31. I did not have an appropriate level of subject matter expertise.							
32. I did have an appropriate level of subject matter expertise.							
33. Overall, the benefits of the proceeding outweighed the disadvantages.							
34. I was satisfied with the proceeding process.							
35. Irrespective of whether or not I have already fulfilled my term or case load obligations under the program, I would accept another case as an Attorney Settlement Officer under Local Rule 23.							

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ATTORNEY SETTLEMENT OFFICERS Please refer to the rating factors below. Check one response for each statement.							
SETTLEMENT OUTCOME	6	5	4	3	2	1	
36. The case was resolved before the proceeding.							
37. The case was not resolved by the proceeding, but the proceeding resulted in meaningful agreements on future case management.							
38. The case was not resolved by the proceeding, but the parties agreed to revisit the possibility of settlement at a specified future date.							
39. The case was not resolved by the proceeding, and the proceeding was detrimental to a resolution of the case.							
40. I believe the parties will comply with the terms of the settlement reached as a result of the proceeding.							
41. I was satisfied with the proceeding outcome.							
COMMENTS:							